DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 294 AL 001 940

By-Ervin-Tripp, Susan

Summer Workshops in Sociolinguistics: Research on Children's Acquisition of Communicative Competence.
California Univ., Berkeley.; Social Science Research Council, New York, N.Y. Committee on Sociolinguistics.
Pub Date Jun 69
Note-5p.
Available from-Limited number of copies available from the Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
Journal Cit-Items: v23 n2 Jun 69
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.35
Descriptors-•Child Language, •Cross Cultural Studies, Cultural Differences, Doctoral Programs, Intercultural Programs, •Interdisciplinary Approach, Language Usage, Nonverbal Communication, Research Design, Research Methodology, Sociocultural Patterns, •Sociolinguistics, Student Research, •Summer Workshops, Verbal Communication

During the summer of 1968 a special summer program in sociolinguistics ("Language, Society, and the Child") was held at the University of California, Berkeley. This program grew out of the research on "children's language acquisition in a variety of cultures" which has been underway at that institution for four years. Originally it was planned to restrict the program to 32 pre- and post-doctoral students with backgrounds in linguistics and the social sciences. Among these were seven who had recently returned from making field studies, guided by the "Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence" (ED 015 434). The participants attended four workshops, each restricted to eight participants: one on child grammar, two on sociolinguistics, and one on child phonology. They also took courses in the regular University summer program. It was found, upon opening the workshops to auditors, that the extra participants were one of the factors working against successful analysis of the field data. Some of the important topics which were discussed were the structure of early grammatical constructions, the rules for social uses of language in children's cultures, and the effects of the milieu of the child on the rate and type of language development. The effectiveness of these workshops as training devices is also evaluated in this article. (JD)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED029294

SUMMER WORKSHOPS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS: RESEARCH ON CHILDREN'S ACQUISITION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

by Susan Ervin-Tripp *

DURING the past four years, a research group at the University of California, Berkeley, has been studying children's language acquisition in a variety of cultures. The Council's Committee on Sociolinguistics, because of its concern that most earlier research on such learning had largely neglected the processes by which children learn not simply the grammar and phonetics of a language, but when and how—in different social contexts—to use it, encouraged the group to extend the scope of its project both geographically and substantively, to include field studies in several different areas of the world and to investigate the broader aspects of learning implied in the term "acquisition of communicative competence." Thus the group has been concerned with three aspects of that subject: (1) What features of phonological, grammatical, and semantic development seem to be universal? What features can be related to special structures in particular languages? (2) What are the patterns of development in various social uses of language? How early and in what forms do sociolinguistic rules appear? (3) What are the relations between the social organization of the community, values about language and its uses, and how the child is spoken to and rewarded for speaking?

In this project my collaborators have been John Gumperz, anthropologist and linguist, Dan Slobin, psycholinguist, and a group of advanced graduate students who participated in preparation of a preliminary *Field Manual* to guide their joint efforts in sites around the world.[1] The first fruits of this research appeared in the summer of 1968 in the data and experience brought back by these students, who had attempted to apply the tests in the manual while living in foreign cultures as participant observers for a year or more after completion of their formal anthropological and linguistic training.

The summer program consisted of four workshops, each restricted to 8 participants: one on child grammar, conducted by Slobin; two on sociolinguistics, conducted by Ervin-Tripp and Gumperz; and one on child phonology, conducted by Charles Ferguson of Stanford University (chairman of the Committee on Sociolinguistics). The sociolinguistics groups were particularly concerned with problems in assessing beliefs about language, studying code-switching, discovering sociolinguistic rules, and determining the social meaning of speech variation. Their purpose was to integrate microsociolinguistics by relating the insights of generative grammar to social interaction theory, in the context of specific research problems.

The workshop participants included 32 pre- and postdoctoral students with backgrounds in linguistics and the social sciences. Among these were seven who had recently returned from making field studies, guided by the *Field Manual* which had also been used by the directors of the workshops in their own research.[2] The seven field workers visited the various workshops when called upon, to discuss their experience in the field and problems encountered in collecting and analyzing data. A number of distinguished visiting scholars took part for one to three weeks in the workshops; some of them also gave public lectures.[3] The workshop participants

* The author is Professor of Rhetoric at the University of California, Berkeley, and a member of the Council's Committee on Sociolinguistics. With her colleagues John J. Gumperz, Professor of Anthropology, also a member of the committee, and Dan I. Slobin, Associate Professor of Psychology, she has been engaged for some time in research on children's language learning and in preparation of a manual of field study methods. With funds granted to the Council by the National Science Foundation (Grant Nos. GS-1241, GS-1919, and GZ-994) for the committee's program, support was provided for field work in 1966–68 by predoctoral students associated with the project. The summer workshops described here were cosponsored by the committee and partially supported by its funds. Part of the present report will appear as "The Acquisition of Communicative Competence by Children in Different Cultures," in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Ethnological and Anthropological Sciences*, in press.

1 Dan I. Slobin, ed., *Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence*, University of California, Berkeley, ASUC Store, 1967.

2 The seven students who had completed field work prior to the summer session and the sites of their research were: Ben Blount, Kenya; Jan Brukman, India; Keith Kernan, Samoa; Claudia Mitchell Kernan, California (blacks); Brian Stross, Mexico; Rodney Vlasek, Nigeria; Carolyn Wardrip, California (whites). Also participating in the workshops were David Argoff who was about to begin research in Finland on Russian-Finnish bilinguals, and Edward Hernandez, on Mexican-American bilinguals. Funds for the field work of Messrs. Argoff and Brukman, Mrs. Kernan, and Miss Wardrip had been provided from the committee's research budget; the others were supported by other agencies. A training grant from the National Science Foundation enabled the following students from various universities to attend the workshops before undertaking field work: Kay Atkinson, Mary Ann Campbell, Ronald W. Casson, Sybillyn J. Mehan, P. David Pavy, III, Diana J. Risen, James N. Schenkein, Abigail B. Sher, Sandra M. Storm, and Merrill K. Swain.

3 Public lectures were given on child language, by Edward Klima and Martin Braine; on social factors entering into diversity of language and its use, by Basil Bernstein, Vera John, and Courtney Cazden; on cross-cultural studies of affective meaning, by Leon Jakobovits; on units in natural conversation, by Emanuel Schegloff; and on communicative competence, by Dell Hymes. Besides their visits, the work-

 AL001970

were offered courses in the regular summer program of the University, according to the convenience of the relevant departments. These courses included transformational grammar, phonetics, child language, language and society, and language and the individual.

The actual operation of the summer program was somewhat different than we had expected. The most conspicuous change was in the composition of the workshops. The original restriction of each to 8 students was based on the belief that a larger group would work less efficiently. However, many more students were permitted to audit the workshops, and the effect was to alter completely the nature of the groups, to inhibit the participation of some members, and to convert the sessions from workshops into lectures or large seminars. In any such training program there is of course a painful choice to be made between the benefits of added exposure of "extra" participants to the ideas discussed by each group, and the deeper analysis and freer interchange possible in small groups of persons with greater commitment. In the end, one workshop group voted to meet secretly to make the latter choice possible.

The workshops accomplished somewhat less analysis of field data than we had anticipated. I believe three factors were responsible. One was of course the structure of the workshops, which became in some cases, depending on the number in attendance and the diversity of disciplines represented, general forums for theoretical argument. A second factor was the series of very stimulating visitors, each of whom discussed his own material. Their visits inevitably disrupted somewhat the continuity of work and also attracted additional auditors. Least controllable was the fact that many of the data were not yet in a form to be analyzed, since the workers had just returned from the field and had not reduced their tapes to transcriptions or even catalogued adequately the sociolinguistic data scattered through the tapes. Those topics for which quite specific tests were proposed in the manual—e.g., babbling and imitations—presented the least difficulties for profitable workshop use. The field workers have concluded that there would have been advantages in postponing the summer session for a year to give them time to gain greater control over their materials.

Papers written during the summer included research proposals, further reports on projects already begun, and analysis of the data collected by others. From these papers [4] and the discussions, the issues considered in the workshops will next be illustrated.

The first area of concern, traditional structural development, has the longest and richest history, but we wished to extend knowledge of the variety of language structures. The field workers found that the earliest sentences in English, Luo, and Samoan are so similar in structure and content as to seem like translations. The most interesting test for these early fixed-order sentences was Finnish, since the adult model has free word order. Melissa Bowerman, a graduate student at Harvard University, found that one Finnish-speaking child, before he used suffixes, invented a fixed-order rule, and another invented fixed order in the one place where it mattered for ambiguity—in subject-verb-object sentences.

When samples of children's babbling in Chinese, Russian, and English were compared, judges could not differentiate them,[5] which does not, of course, rule out the possibility that differences are objectively present. Furthermore, some of the well-accepted generalizations about phonological development did not hold true in detailed cases. From the very earliest stages of language development, we could find evidence of style shifting for different addressees and different social contexts, usually in the form of whispering vs. shouting, or intonational variation. These variations are the early features entering into sociolinguistic rules.

SOCIAL USES OF LANGUAGE

The social uses of language by children or adults could be examined in two ways. One is with reference to a psychological system of categories of motive or intent, such as playing with sounds and patterns, obtaining goods and services from others, and so on; the other is in terms of categories—within the culture of the child or of the adult—of speech events, episodes, and speech acts. A marriage ceremony, a conference, judicial trial, dramatic performance, or alphabet game is a *speech event* with identifiable components and rules. To qualify as a native speaker in a speech community one must learn to behave as though one knew these rules. *Episodes* or discourse stages are unified by participants, topic, and focus, for example, a story embedded in a conversation, a set of toasts at a bridal dinner, an exchange of vows in a wedding ceremony. *Speech acts* are the briefest com-

shops profited from visits of Harvey Sacks and Aaron Cicourel, who are concerned with the study of natural conversation, and Ursula Bellugi-Klima and Carlota Smith, who have studied children's language. Daniel Dato reported on his studies of the grammatical structure of competence in bilingual children; William Geohegan, on the structure of address rules; Wick Miller and Roger Shuy, on sociolinguistic field work; John Ross, on new developments in linguistic theory. Erving Goffman joined the group to analyze filmed interaction.

[4] The papers have been made available under their titles through the Educational Research Information Center system at the Center for Applied Linguistics as Working Papers of the Language-Behavior Research Laboratory.

[5] "An Experiment on the Recognition of Babbling," by Kay Atkinson, Brian MacWhinney, and Caroline Stoel.

ponents in episodes: included are requests, commands, greetings, farewells, apologies, introductions, and expressions of thanks.[6]

We would like to know what uses of language exist in children's cultures, which uses are derived from interaction with adults, what the structure of speech events appears to be to children, and what rules of social distribution speech events may have, i.e., when they should occur and who the participants should be.

Examples of "affirmation, testing truthfulness, bets, bargain making, swapping, giving, gaining possession, claiming precedence, avoiding, secret keeping, and obtaining respite" were found by the Opies in their research on the oral tradition of children in Great Britain,[7] but whether these exist as ethnological categories, and the rules for their use remain to be studied in specific face-to-face groups. In the Oakland black community studied by Claudia Mitchell Kernan, children were—as others have noted about urban black children—very verbal and concerned with verbal skills. From the age of two they knew a rich collection of nursery rhymes and songs, and at older ages engaged in such verbal play as alphabet games, poems, stories, riddles, and role-playing games. Taunts were used for group definition. Young children already knew about a form of insult called "sounding," although they produced simplified versions of it, and did not until adolescence become adept at the more complex and subtle verbal insult game called "the dozens" or "signifying." [8]

Numerous instances of role playing reveal that both routines and speech features may identify roles. For example, it was found that four-year-olds know that the term "honey" belongs to mothers. In Oakland a nine-year-old "doctor" said to his patient, "What about —about what, young man?" The child knew that a doctor speaking to his patient uses formal English. Even the youngest children use baby talk features in addressing infants. However, these styles lack internal coherence and tend to appear fleetingly as role markers rather than with the consistency of adult styles.

The kinds of sociolinguistic rules we examined include, first, those in which social features govern the selection of linguistic alternatives, for instance, deferential style to some addressees, colloquial style to others, English to one set, Spanish to specific others. William Geohegan's comparison of address structures of Samal speakers in the Philippines suggests that the number of social features which are involved and the size of the repertoire of alternatives both change even after age 12.[9] A paper by Ronald Casson describes in detail how the study of kin terms of address and reference can help to define relevant social features and examine the social meaning of alternations.

We are concerned, second, with the internal structure of these systems of alternation. How early do children learn to use a uniform formal style, a narrative style, the separation of two languages? Edward Hernandez found phonological separation of languages in three-year-old Mexican Americans, but in Claudia Kernan's role-shifting data the "co-occurrence rules" seem much less strict. It is as though a few stereotyped features are used to *mark* the role, but the children resume unmarked normal speech readily.

Third, we are concerned with sequences within speech events as formal structures that children must learn. They do, of course, learn sequences in games quite early. A simple example of "boundary marking" is that greetings come first on encountering someone. We might expect that the most conspicuous frames for speech events, such as changes in personnel, might be most easily identified by children and be communicated earliest in their rules of sequence. In each of these three kinds of sociolinguistic rules, we are concerned with their productivity—that is, with their effect on the child's ability to behave appropriately without explicit instruction or without imitation; this provides some evidence that he perceives the appropriate social features of the addressee or situation, and that he knows the linguistic patterns required.

INFLUENCES OF ADULTS ON CHILDREN'S SPEECH

We also examined the effects of the milieu of the child on the rate and type of his language development. The most concrete results were presented by Kerry Drach, Ben Kobashigawa, Carol Pfuderer, and Dan Slobin in a series of papers on the linguistic structure of speech *to* children. There has been considerable discussion about how children can handle complex and "degenerate" linguistic material. However, the workshop analyses of data from Cambridge and Oakland samples of speech to children by adults and other children suggest a dramatic characterization of the style used in addressing children.

[6] For further discussion of sociolinguistic concepts, see John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds., "The Ethnography of Communication," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 6, Part 2, 1964; Hymes and Gumperz, *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, in press; Susan Ervin-Tripp, "Sociolinguistics" in L. Berkowitz, ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, in press.

[7] Iona Opie and Peter Opie, *The Lore and Language of School Children*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967, Chap. 8.

[8] A full report on the verbal skills found among the Oakland children will appear in Mrs. Kernan's doctoral dissertation (University of California, Berkeley).

[9] A detailed report will be included in his dissertation (Stanford University).

It is brief, highly repetitive, syntactically simple, lacks hesitations and false starts, has few subordinate clauses, and abounds in questions and imperatives encouraging response. The frequency of basic syntactic devices is sufficiently similar in the different samples to suggest a common adaptation to child addressees, although speakers varied somewhat in ability to adjust their style to the changing competence of children as they grow older. We have made this analysis only for English, and do not know whether there are similar features in speech addressed to infants in other languages.

While the structure of speech to children may be similar in different social groups, there may be quite different uses of language in different families. In this field the most fully developed research has been done in England by Basil Bernstein and his collaborators, who have recently completed a detailed study of the relations between adult communicative needs and values, practices toward children, and children's speech. He has argued that the uses of communication, for example in adult occupations, may vary widely and systematically. These in turn affect what adults value in children's speech, what uses they stimulate, what kinds of appeals they make to children during socialization, and so on. For example, if parents allow children to talk about the reasons for an act, from an early age the children may be rewarded for verbal persuasion. In contrast, families in which behavior is in accordance with status-specific rules or power and authority alone do not stimulate similar uses of language. In the children's speech studied there were considerable differences in the elaboration of nominal categories in terms of variety, adjectival richness, and amount of modification, in relation to social variations.[10] These differences were attributed to the uses of language in families. Bernstein spent several weeks participating in the workshops, explaining his theories and data schedules, and enabled the participants to correct common misconceptions of Americans about the London research.

How many of these findings can be tested by traditional methods of informant work with adults? Not many. We compared the various interview schedules about language and values concerning language use employed in our field sites and found that often only intensive preliminary exploration of the framework of terminology and belief with a few individuals could lay an appropriate foundation for extensive interviewing. Comparing interviews in the Koya tribal group in India with those of lower middle-class Californians, we found a large difference in the elaboration of lexicon and the conceptual framework for discussing questions about language itself. On some concrete points there was a lot of agreement, as on when babies first talk, but terms for speech acts, for styles of speech, and for differences in speech were sometimes absent. One needs, then, to consider what kinds of societies require that their members be aware of aspects of speaking. This is just a special case of the question why an elaborated lexicon for any semantic domain is developed—if in some societies speech is a domain as such.

The arguments over interviewing brought to the surface a conflict between the points of view of anthropologists who are very conscious that surface forms may have different meanings in different social groups, and psychologists who are concerned with standardization and comparability. The psychologists among the workshop participants, as a result of some vivid illustrations presented by the field workers, became more aware of the relevance of ethnographic context, and the inadequacy of translation as a device for retaining the "deep structure" of information sought. The conflict of values in such encounters is best reconciled through prolonged informal discussion and joint commitment to a research problem, such as those examined last summer, which raises questions of comparability and validity.

The sociolinguistics involved in the summer training program is a special branch which has come to be known as microsociolinguistics. Features of the larger society such as degree of industrialization, literacy, and population density were considered relevant only as they were represented in the language uses to which the child was exposed, the values of his socializers, and his linguistic daily cycle.

THE WORKSHOPS AS TRAINING DEVICES

How efficient were the workshops as training devices? Since their conclusion we have been working on convergent data from the several field sites. We have a glimpse of what could have happened if the participants had defined narrower issues and remained committed to them for three months, rather than visiting all the workshops as many did. From the standpoint of training, there are advantages in working jointly on the same body of data. On the other hand, many participants believed strongly that they needed breadth of training too, and that if they were confined, for instance, to studying the grammar of two-word sentences, they would not learn about bilingual code-switching rules and the structure of address-term selection as examples of the "grammar" of sociolinguistic regularities. Because of the broad areas covered by the workshops, and the unusual degree

[10] Basil Bernstein, "A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization," in Hymes and Gumperz, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics, op. cit.;* W. Brandis and D. Henderson, *Social Class, Language and Communication,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, in press.

of cross-disciplinary background represented by the faculty, the students were exposed to a wide range of related work, and for many the experience was intense. Anyone who has participated in advanced cross-disciplinary groups knows how painfully slow the mutual education is, once the participants yield part of their sense of the primacy of their own field to a common commitment to a conceptual or research task. This of course was the issue behind the question of open or closed workshops, and on the basis of experience with a group including linguists, educators, psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and speech teachers, we still do not know the wiser solution.

In farewell some of the students pointed out that unlike faculty who travel to conferences, they had never met their fellows from other universities. For some, this was the first time they had met anyone sharing their intellectual commitments and it was an exhilarating experience, imparting some of the shock of realignment of beliefs. Since we believe that the kind of field research we envision in sociolinguistics can best be conducted by collaboration across disciplines, the encounters made may lay the basis for future productive research.

For most of the participants the summer's interchanges raised many new questions, and groups at the Universities of Illinois, Michigan, Texas, Harvard, and California at Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Berkeley are continuing research along the lines discussed.[11] In Berkeley work continues on integrating the field results with the aim of developing a more comprehensive theory of acquisition of sociolinguistic competence (or communicative competence), on studies of the use of language in identifying group boundaries, the structure and development of code- and style-switching in children, and formal analysis of the structure of coding rules.

11 In Santa Barbara, Aaron Cicourel, Kenneth Jennings, and Robert Boese are continuing work on the development of communicative competence in children who use deaf sign language, some of whom later become skilled at code-switching between native sign, English-influenced sign and finger-spelling, and oral-lipreading. Boese, whose mother tongue is sign language, gave several videotaped presentations of these phenomena.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY IN PRAGUE, OCTOBER 7-11, 1968

by Jaromír Janoušek and Henri Tajfel *

THE idea of the Prague conference grew out of discussions at the international meeting of social psychologists held in Vienna in April 1967, under the joint auspices of the Council's Committee on Transnational Social Psychology and the European Association for Experimental Social Psychology.[1] The participants in the Vienna conference found that they had many common research interests and agreed that a second meeting to continue and extend the contacts initiated in Vienna would help to advance research and international scientific cooperation in social psychology. A planning committee [2] was named to explore the prospects for such a conference, and an invitation to hold it in Prague was proffered by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Funds for partial support of the conference were made available to the Council by the Ford Foundation.

At a meeting of the planning committee with Henry W. Riecken at Aix-en-Provence in January 1968, joint sponsorship of the conference by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, the Committee on Transnational Social Psychology, and the European Association for Experimental Social Psychology was arranged; a program of lectures, sessions of working groups to examine special topics, and informal discussions of developments in social psychology in various countries was worked out; and the scholars to be invited were selected.

The conference was held at the Hotel International in Prague, October 7–11, 1968. Forty-three participants were able to attend; they came from Canada, the United States, United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.[3] Short wel-

* The authors are affiliated respectively with the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague, and the University of Bristol, and are members of the Council's Committee on Transnational Social Psychology. The other members are Leon Festinger, New School for Social Research (chairman); Morton Deutsch, Columbia University; Harold H. Kelley, University of California, Los Angeles; Jaap Koekebakker, Netherlands Institute for Preventive Medicine, Leiden; John T. Lanzetta, Dartmouth College; Serge Moscovici, University of Paris; and Stanley Schachter, Columbia University; *staff*, Stanley Lehmann.

1 Cf. "Transnational Social Psychology: Notes on the International Conference in Vienna, April 9–14, 1967," *Items*, September 1967, pp. 30–32.

2 Henri Tajfel (chairman); Martin Irle, University of Mannheim; Jaromír Janoušek; Harold H. Kelley; Serge Moscovici; and Vladimir A. Yadov, University of Leningrad.

3 In addition to Messrs. Deutsch, Festinger, Irle, Janoušek, Kelley, and Tajfel, the participants were Robert P. Abelson, Yale University; Erika Apfelbaum and Michel Pêcheux, Laboratory of Social Psychology, University of Paris; Maria Carmela Barbiero, Anna Maria Galdo, and Gustavo Iacono, University of Naples; Vera Bokorová, Zdenek Helus,